UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/750,180	12/31/2003	Vibhu Mittal	16113-1318001	4999

26192 7590 08/06/2010

FISH & RICHARDSON P.C.
PO BOX 1022
MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55440-1022

EXAMINER	
HUYNH, THU V	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2178	

NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
08/06/2010	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

PATDOCTC@fr.com

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/750,180	MITTAL, VIBHU	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	THU V. HUYNH	2178	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *08 June 2010*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1,3-11,13-20 and 22-33* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1,3-11,13-20 and 22-33* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date *6/9/2010*.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is responsive to communications: RCE filed on 6/8/2010 to application filed on 12/31/03.

2. Claims 31-33 are added. Claims 1, 3-11, 13-20, 22-33 are pending in the case. Claims 1, 11 and 20 are independent claims.

3. There are two sets of rejections in this office action.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 1, 3-5, 8-11, 13-14, 17-20, 22-23 and 26-33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being Unpatentable over Goodisman et al., US 2002/0069223 A1, published 06/06/02 in view of Golovchinsky et al., US 2004/0078757, filed 08/31/2001.

Regarding independent claim 1, Goodisman teaches the steps of:

- locating a text reference in a source document, wherein the locating the text reference comprises deriving the text reference based on a statistical model of at least one of text formatting and lexical cues, and in which the text reference does not containing a hyperlink (Goodisman, [0052], [0053], parsing a document into text blocks, wherein a text block includes one or more object, the parsing based on format elements including HTML or XML tags, or textual elements including sentences, questions,

line breaks, spaces, hyphens, dashes, strings of digits, strings of letters, groups of words, or images, icons, etc.);

- identifying a target document relating to the text reference (Goodisman, [0039], [0052], [0053], [0059]; identifying a target document related to the text block that includes the object);
- deriving an anchor text corresponding to the target document utilizing the source using the located text reference (Goodisman, fig.6; [0053], [0056]; obtaining and modifying the label to a highlighted/underlined hyperlink, such as highlighted/underlined name "JohnSmith" hyperlink in the document; linking the highlighted/underlined text reference to the target document when the hyperlink is activated/selected);
- generating a hyperlink to the target document (Goodisman, [0053], [0056], [0059]; selecting/clicking the object causing retrieving and displaying the target document); and
- associated the hyperlink with the anchor text (Goodisman, [0053], [0056]; automatically associating the hyperlink with the name "JohnSmith" by linkify engine so that selecting/clicking the name "JohnSmith" causing retrieving and displaying the target document).

Goodisman does not teach identifying a target document including performing a search using a search engine in which the search is based on a query derived from the text reference and selecting the target document from one or more search results responsive to the query.

Golovchinsky teaches identifying a target document relating to text reference including performing a search based on a query derived from the text reference using a search engine and selecting the target document from one or more search results (Golovchinsky, [0018], [0067], [0077]; searching for document (target document) containing references (text reference) to other documents)

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined Golovchinsky's teaching and Goodisman's teaching to include a search engine to identify a document relating to the text reference, since the combination would have searched and provided related documents associated with the hyperlink to the user.

Regarding claim 3, which is dependent on claim 1, Goodisman teaches comparing text from the source document with a list of predetermined references (Goodisman, [0053]; pattern matcher includes "linguistic, keyword proximity and word sequence analysis" to identify a name).

Regarding claim 4, which is dependent on claim 1, Goodisman teaches locating a label corresponding to the text reference and associating the hyperlink with the label (Goodisman, fig.6; [0052], [0053], [0056]; locating/establishing a label, such as name "JohnSmith", as an object for the text block).

Regarding claim 5, which is dependent on claim 4, Goodisman teaches deriving the label based on a statistical model of at least one of text formatting and lexical cues (Goodisman, [0053]; obtaining the label, such as name, phone number, social security number based on "linguistic, keyword proximity and word sequence analysis").

Regarding claim 8, which is dependent on claim 1, Goodisman teaches parsing the text reference into a plurality pieces of text, wherein the identifying, deriving, generating, and associating are performed for each of the plurality pieces of text (Goodisman; fig.6; [0024],[0053]; wherein the text block is a sentence that has two objects so that two hyperlinks are generated as in fig.6).

Regarding claim 9, which is dependent on claim 1, Goodisman teaches wherein the source document is selected from the group consisting of an HTML document, a text document, a postscript document, a Portable Document Format (PDF) document, a PowerPoint document, a Word document, and Excel document and a close-captioned video (Goodisman, [0030],[0050]).

Regarding claim 10, which is dependent on claim 1, Goodisman teaches the text reference is reference to one of a paper, article, company, institution, product, search engine, image, object, and geographical location (Goodisman; [0053]; the text block includes an object).

Regarding claim 31, which is dependent on claim 1, Goodisman teaches the text reference is an object, such as name, number, trademark, figure, icon in the document

(Goodisman, [0024]). Golovchinsky teaches identifying text reference is citation in a document (Golovchinsky, [0016]).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined Golovchinsky's teaching and Goodisman's teaching to locate citation in the document, since the combination would have provided related document associated with objects including citation for the user.

Claims 11, 13-14, 17-19, 32 are for a computer system including a program in a storage device performing the method of claims 1, 3-5, 8-10, respectively and are rejected under the same rationale.

Claims 20, 22-23, 26-28, 33 are for a computer readable medium including instructions performing the method of claims 1, 3-5, 8-10, respectively and are rejected under the same rationale.

Regarding claim 29, which is dependent on claim 1, Golovchinsky teaches performing the search using a search term, the search term being determined based on the text reference (Golovchinsky, [0071]).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined Golovchinsky's teaching and Goodisman's teaching to search related documents based on text reference, since the combination would have searched and provided related documents associated with an anchor text to the user.

Regarding claim 30, which is dependent on claim 1, determining the target document according to a rating determined by the search engine (Golovchinsky, [0071]).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined Golovchinsky's teaching and Goodisman's teaching to rate documents, since the combination would have searched and provided most related documents associated with an anchor text to the user based on ranking or filtering.

6. Claims 6, 15 and 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Goodisman and Golovchinsky as applied to claim 4 above and further in view of Glover et al., US 2003/0221163 A1, filed 02/03.

Regarding claim 6, which is dependent on claim 4, Goodisman does not explicitly teach deriving a label anchor text depending on whether the label corresponding to the text reference precedes or follows a text phrase.

Glover teaches deriving a label anchor text depending on whether the label corresponding to the text reference precedes or follows a text phrase (Glover, figures 4; [0034]; extended anchortext (410, 414, 418) are extracted including text references before, after or before and after label "Yahoo").

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined Glover's teaching and Goodisman's teaching to extract text before, after or surround the label, since the combination would have provided label anchor text including the label and text surround the label to link to a target document.

Claim 15 is for a computer system performing the method of claim 6 is rejected under the same rationale.

Claim 24 is for a computer readable medium including instructions performing the method of claim 6 is rejected under the same rationale.

7. Claims 7, 16 and 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Goodisman, Golovchinsky and Glover as applied to claim 6 above and further in view of Hennings et al., US 6,763,496 B1, filed 03/31/99.

Regarding claim 7, which is dependent on claim 6, Goodisman does not explicitly teaches the label anchor text is a longest noun phrase extracted from the text phrase following or preceding the label when the label precedes or follows the phrase, respectively.

Hennings teaches anchor text link comprising a phrase, a picture icon, or a phrase and an icon (Hennings, col.2, lines 54-65).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined Hennings' teaching into Goodisman and Glover's teaching to extract a phrase before, after the label, since the combination would have provided label anchor text including a phrase before or after the label; or combination of a phrase before or after the label and an the label (object such as icon, image, trademark, identifier).

Claim 16 is for a computer system performing the method of claim 6 is rejected under the same rationale.

Claim 25 is for a computer readable medium including instructions performing the method of claim 6 is rejected under the same rationale.

8. Claims 1, 3-5, 8-11, 13-14, 17-20, 22-23 and 26-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being Unpatentable over Goodisman et al., US 2002/0069223 A1, published 06/06/02 in view of Kelley et al., US 20080195518, priority filed 09/30/2003.

Regarding independent claim 1, Goodisman teaches the steps of:

- locating a text reference in a source document, wherein the locating the text reference comprises deriving the text reference based on a statistical model of at least one of text formatting and lexical cues, and in which the text reference does not containing a hyperlink (Goodisman, [0052], [0053], parsing a document into text blocks, wherein a text block includes one or more object, the parsing based on format elements including HTML or XML tags, or textual elements including sentences, questions, line breaks, spaces, hyphens, dashes, strings of digits, strings of letters, groups of words, or images, icons, etc.);
- identifying a target document relating to the text reference (Goodisman, [0039], [0052], [0053], [0059]; identifying a target document related to the text block that includes the object);
- deriving an anchor text corresponding to the target document utilizing the source using the located text reference (Goodisman, fig.6; [0053], [0056]; obtaining and modifying the label to a highlighted/underlined hyperlink, such as

highlighted/underlined name "JohnSmith" hyperlink in the document; linking the highlighted/underlined text reference to the target document when the hyperlink is activated/selected);

- generating a hyperlink to the target document (Goodisman, [0053], [0056], [0059]; selecting/clicking the object causing retrieving and displaying the target document); and
- associated the hyperlink with the anchor text (Goodisman, [0053], [0056]; automatically associating the hyperlink with the name "JohnSmith" by linkify engine so that selecting/clicking the name "JohnSmith" causing retrieving and displaying the target document).

Goodisman does not teach identifying a target document including performing a search using a search engine in which the search is based on a query derived from the text reference and selecting the target document from one or more search results responsive to the query.

Kelley teaches identifying a target document relating to text reference including performing a search using a search engine in which the search is based on a query derived from the text reference and selecting the target document from one or more search results responsive to the query (Kelley, fig.4, [0030], [0033]; searching relevant documents based on keywords and selecting the most relevant documents).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined Kelley's teaching and Goodisman's teaching to include a search engine to identify a document relating to the text reference, since the combination would

have searched and provided related documents in order to associate with the hyperlink to the user.

Regarding claim 3, which is dependent on claim 1, Goodisman teaches comparing text from the source document with a list of predetermined references (Goodisman, [0053]; pattern matcher includes "linguistic, keyword proximity and word sequence analysis" to identify a name).

Regarding claim 4, which is dependent on claim 1, Goodisman teaches locating a label corresponding to the text reference and associating the hyperlink with the label (Goodisman, fig.6; [0052], [0053], [0056]; locating/establishing a label, such as name "JohnSmith", as an object for the text block).

Regarding claim 5, which is dependent on claim 4, Goodisman teaches deriving the label based on a statistical model of at least one of text formatting and lexical cues (Goodisman, [0053]; obtaining the label, such as name, phone number, social security number based on "linguistic, keyword proximity and word sequence analysis").

Regarding claim 8, which is dependent on claim 1, Goodisman teaches parsing the text reference into a plurality pieces of text, wherein the identifying, deriving, generating, and associating are performed for each of the plurality pieces of text (Goodisman; fig.6;

[0024],[0053]; wherein the text block is a sentence that has two objects so that two hyperlinks are generated as in fig.6).

Regarding claim 9, which is dependent on claim 1, Goodisman teaches wherein the source document is selected from the group consisting of an HTML document, a text document, a postscript document, a Portable Document Format (PDF) document, a PowerPoint document, a Word document, and Excel document and a close-captioned video (Goodisman, [0030],[0050]).

Regarding claim 10, which is dependent on claim 1, Goodisman teaches the text reference is reference to one of a paper, article, company, institution, product, search engine, image, object, and geographical location (Goodisman; [0053]; the text block includes an object)

Claims 11, 13-14 and 17-19 are for a computer system including a program in a storage device performing the method of claims 1, 3-5, 8-10, respectively and are rejected under the same rationale.

Claims 20, 22-23 and 26-28 are for a computer readable medium including instructions performing the method of claims 1, 3-5, 8-10, respectively and are rejected under the same rationale.

Regarding claim 29, which is dependent on claim 1, Kelley teaches performing the search using a search term, the search term being determined based on the text reference (Kelley, fig.4, [0030], [0033]).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined Kelley's teaching and Goodisman's teaching to search related documents based on text reference, since the combination would have searched and provided related documents associated with an anchor text to the user.

Regarding claim 30, which is dependent on claim 1, Kelley teaches determining the target document according to a rating determined by the search engine (Kelley, fig.4, [0030], [0033]).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined Kelley's teaching and Goodisman's teaching to include rating related documents, since the combination would have searched and provided most related documents associated with an anchor text to the user based on ranking or filtering.

9. Claims 6, 15 and 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Goodisman and Kelley as applied to claim 4 above and further in view of Glover et al., US 2003/0221163 A1, filed 02/03.

Regarding claim 6, which is dependent on claim 4, Goodisman does not explicitly teach deriving a label anchor text depending on whether the label corresponding to the text reference precedes or follows a text phrase.

Glover teaches deriving a label anchor text depending on whether the label corresponding to the text reference precedes or follows a text phrase (Glover, figures 4; [0034]; extended

anchortext (410, 414, 418) are extracted including text references before, after or before and after label "Yahoo").

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined Glover's teaching and Goodisman's teaching to extract text before, after or surround the label, since the combination would have provided label anchor text including the label and text surround the label to link to a target document.

Claim 15 is for a computer system performing the method of claim 6 is rejected under the same rationale.

Claim 24 is for a computer readable medium including instructions performing the method of claim 6 is rejected under the same rationale.

10. Claims 7, 16 and 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Goodisman, Kelley and Glover as applied to claim 6 above and further in view of Hennings et al., US 6,763,496 B1, filed 03/31/99.

Regarding claim 7, which is dependent on claim 6, Goodisman does not explicitly teaches the label anchor text is a longest noun phrase extracted from the text phrase following or preceding the label when the label precedes or follows the phrase, respectively.

Hennings teaches anchor text link comprising a phrase, a picture icon, or a phrase and an icon (Hennings, col.2, lines 54-65).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined Hennings' teaching into Goodisman and Glover's

teaching to extract a phrase before, after the label, since the combination would have provided label anchor text including a phrase before or after the label; or combination of a phrase before or after the label and an the label (object such as icon, image, trademark, identifier).

Claim 16 is for a computer system performing the method of claim 6 is rejected under the same rationale.

Claim 25 is for a computer readable medium including instructions performing the method of claim 6 is rejected under the same rationale.

11. Claims 31-33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Goodisman and Kelley as applied to claim 4 above and further in view of Golovchinsky et al., US 2004/0078757, filed 08/31/2001.

Regarding claims 31-33, which is dependent on claims 1, 11, 20, Goodisman teaches the text reference is an object, such as name, number, trademark, figure, icon in the document (Goodisman, [0024]). Golovchinsky teaches identifying text reference is citation in a document (Golovchinsky, [0016]).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined Golovchinsky's teaching and Goodisman's teaching to locate citation in the document, since the combination would have provided related document associated with objects including citation for the user.

Response to Arguments

10. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1, 3-11, 13-20, 22-30 have been considered but are not persuasive.

Applicants primarily ague with respect to claims independent claims 1, 11, 20 that Golovchinsky does not teaches the performing search is "based on a query derived from the text reference", since the Golovchinsky mentioned "searching a document database" and the "query" does not appear anywhere in Golovchinsky (Remarks, page 10).

This is not persuasive. Golovchinsky teaches "searching a document database for documents containing one or more references to these target documents" (Golovchinsky, [0018]), wherein the reference is text reference (Golovchinsky, [0042], "Alternatively, "Chandler v. Miler" (FIG. 6B), which is a reference to another document"). These indicate that the search must be based on the text reference "Chandler v. Miler" in order to find which documents containing the text reference.

Besides, Kelly et al. specifically teaches such limitation as explained in the rejection above.

Conclusion

12. The prior art made of record, listed on PTO 892 provided to Applicant is considered to have relevancy to the claimed invention.

Applicant should review each identified reference carefully before responding to this office action to properly advance the case in light of the prior art.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to THU V. HUYNH whose telephone number is (571)272-4126. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday to Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Stephen S. Hong can be reached on (571) 272-4124. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Thu Huynh/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2178
July 30, 2010